

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/695,632		<b>Applicant(s)</b> CONNOR ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> KATHERINE DOWE		<b>Art Unit</b> 3734	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) KATHERINE DOWE.

(2) DAVID BURNS.

**Date of Interview:** 16 May 2011

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☒ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description: n/a.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

  

Claims discussed:

1, 6, 8, 55, 56, 68, and 69

Prior art documents discussed:

  

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  

/Katherine M Dowe/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3734

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner indicated the allowability of claim 55 and suggested an amendment to claims 1 and 68 clarifying the non-liquid jet tissue-excision component comprised a cup- or scoop- shaped tissue receptacle or element, wherein the sharpened edge extends circumferentially around a rim of the non-liquid jet tissue excision component or around a rim of the cup- or scoop-shaped element. Dependent claims would be amended to correct antecedent basis and claim 56 would be cancelled as it does not further limit parent claim 55. Applicant's attorney initially agreed to the proposed changes to claims 1, 6, 8, 55, and 56. However, agreement was not reached with respect to claim 68 as the attorney needed to further discuss the proposed amendment with the Applicant. A follow-up from the attorney regarding claim 68 was not received.